UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/833,414	04/12/2001	Rabindranath Dutta	AUS920010003US1	1592

35525	7590	07/26/2005

IBM CORP (YA)
C/O YEE & ASSOCIATES PC
P.O. BOX 802333
DALLAS, TX 75380

EXAMINER
SHORTLEDGE, THOMAS E

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2654	

DATE MAILED: 07/26/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/833,414	DUTTA ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Thomas E. Shortledge	2654

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *09 May 2005*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-23* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-23* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *09 May 2005* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This communication is in response to Remarks filed 05/09/2005.

2.   The objection to the drawings has be withdrawn in accordance with the

applicants' amendments.

3.   Claims 1-23 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 12, and 23 are

independent.

Response to Arguments

4.   Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-23 have been considered but are

moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

6.   Claims 1-3, 6, 12-14, 17, 21, and 22 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being

anticipated by Malsheen et al. (5,634,084).

As to claim 1, Malsheen et al. teach:

responsive to user interaction, receiving a document having one or more terms (the user requests that the application "read" aloud an e-mail message having several paragraphs of text in the body, col. 4, lines 33-36);

responsive to receiving the document and without further user interaction with the document, automatically receiving a specified annotation file having one or more term expansions, the specified annotation file being specified by the document (specialized abbreviation tables are used for each type of input documents, documents pertaining to a law department would include an abbreviation translation table having abbreviations used in the professions, an documents in the bio-tech research area would have an abbreviation translation table with abbreviations used in the biology field, col. 4, lines 52-62);

automatically replacing without user interaction, in the document, a term of the one or more terms with a corresponding term expansion from the specified annotation file to form a modified document (the text expander expands the number and abbreviation, and then passes the expanded term the text to speech processor, col. 7, line 59-61, and col. 8, line 12-24); and

presenting the modified document as audible speech (the expansion is passed to the TTS converter, col. 8, lines 52-53).

As to claim 12, Malsheen et al. teach:

a communications interface configured to receive a document having one or more terms and receive a specified annotation file having one or more term expansions, wherein the specified annotation file is specified by the document (an email interface with specialized abbreviation tables are used for each type of input documents, documents pertaining to a law department would include an abbreviation translation table having abbreviations used in the professions, an documents in the bio-tech research area would have an abbreviation translation table with abbreviations used in the biology field, col. 4, lines 52-62), and wherein the specified annotation file describes one or more properties, each property having a value, where a property of the one or more properties and the value corresponding to the property describe the expansion terms (an abbreviations translation table describing one or more properties, each with a value, where the properties and value describe the expansion of terms, col. 8, lines 13-24); and

a transcoder configured to access the document and the specified file and replace, in the document, a term of the one or more terms with a corresponding term expansion from the specified annotation file (replacing terms within a document with a corresponding term expansion from a specified annotation file, col. 8, lines 13-24).

As to claims 2 and 13, Malsheen et al. teach the term comprises an acronym and the corresponding term expansion comprises an expansion of the acronym (expanding acronyms, col. 11, lines 1-10).

As to claims 3 and 14, Malsheen et al. teach the term comprise a word

(abbreviations) and the corresponding term expansion comprises a definition of the

word (providing full definitions for abbreviations, col. 8, lines 10-25).

As to claims 6 and 17, Malsheen et al. teach the document comprises a

hypertext markup language document (an email document (col. 4, line 40), where it

would be necessary that an email document contains hypertext markup language, since

emails can be constructed to contain the hypertext markup language).

As to claim 21, Malsheen et al. teach a display device configured to display the

document (a computer system with a display, col. 3, lines 60-63).

As to claim 22, Malsheen et al. teach an audible output device to present the

document as audible speech (an audible speaker, col. 3, lines 61-63).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

8.   Claims 4 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over
Malsheen et al. as applied to claims 1 and 12 above, and further in view of Flanagan et
al. (6,339,754).

As to claims 4 and 15, Malsheen et al. teach term expansion (col. 8, lines 10-25.)

However, Malsheen et al. do not teach the term comprise a word in a first
language and a translation of the word into a second language.

However, Flanagan et al. teach a communication system using a text-to-speech
application able to translate from a first language, into a second language (col. 6, lines
2-9).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at time of
the invention to combine the term expansions of Malsheen et al. with the translation
process of Flanagan et al. to allow people speaking different languages to communicate
with each other, as taught by Flanagan et al. (col. 6, lines 1-3).

9.   Claims 5 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over
Malsheen et al. as applied to claims 1 and 12 above.

As to claims 5 and 16, Malsheen et al. do not explicitly teach the term comprises
a series of words and the corresponding term expansion comprise an acronym for the
series of words. However, Malsheen et al. teach expanding acronyms for proper
speech output (col. 12, lines 37-38), where it would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to create appropriate acronyms for a

series of words to produce an output that contains the ordinary terms within the

knowledge of the representative field, (col. 4, lines 52-62).

10.   Claims 7-11, and 18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Malsheen et al. as applied to claims 1 and 12 above, in further view

of Miller (An Introduction to the Resource Description Framework).

        As to claims 7 and 18, Malsheen et al. do not teach the specified annotation file

comprises a resource description framework file.

        However, Miller teaches that a resource description framework can be used to

publish both human-readable and machine-processable vocabularies, (page 2).

        Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary art at the time of the

invention to combine the text analyst system of Malsheen et al. with the resource

description framework of Miller to improve the access to he globally distributed

information of the World Wide Web, as taught by Miller (page 1).

        As to claim 8, Malsheen et al. do not teach the resource description framework

file describes one or more properties, each property having a value.

        However, Miller teaches a resource description framework file that has properties

associated with resources, each property having a value, (page 3).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary art at the time of the invention to combine the text analyst system of Malsheen et al. with the resource description framework of Miller to improve the access to he globally distributed information of the World Wide Web, as taught by Miller (page 1).

As to claim 9, Malsheen et al. do not teach wherein a property of the one r more properties and the value corresponding to the property describe the expansion terms. As to claims 9 and 20, Bernth et al. do not teach a property of the one or more properties and the value corresponding to the property describe the expansion terms.

However, Miller teaches the values of the properties describe the expansion of the term, as in figure 3, where Author_001 is expanding into Affiliation, Name, and Email.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary art at the time of the invention to combine the text analyst system of Malsheen et al. with the resource description framework and the property values of Miller to improve the access to he globally distributed information of the World Wide Web, as taught by Miller (page 1).

As to claim 10, Malsheen et al. do not teach the method is performed by a plug-in for a web browser.

However, Miller teaches constructing the resource description framework is an application of XML (page 1).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary art at the time of the invention to combine the text analyst system of Malsheen et al. with the resource description framework and the property values of Miller to improve the access to he globally distributed information of the World Wide Web, as taught by Miller (page 1).

As to claim 11, Malsheen et al. teach the step of automatically replacing comprises a step of determining whether to perform the automatically replacing step based upon an identity of a user (the user makes a call to the application to start the reading of document, which includes the expanding of terms, col. 4, lines 22-35).

As to claim 19, Malsheen et al. at least one flag indicating whether a given term must be replaced by the transcoder (indicating which words need to be processed by the next step in the replacement process, col. 7, lines 63-67).

As to claim 20, Malsheen et al. does not explicitly teach a user may override the flag indication to disable the term replacement (a user application such as an email application where the user has control of the application, and the application is able to indicate which words need to processed by the next step in the replacement process, (col. 4, lines 40-45, and col. 7, lines 63-67), where it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, that the user would be able to control the system and disable the term replacement since the user can have full control over the application).

11.   Claim 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Malsheen et al. in view of Miller.

       As to claim 23, Malsheen et al. teach:

       instructions for receiving a document having one or more terms (an email

application for supplying a document to be expanded (col. 4, lines 40-43), where it

would be necessary that the mail application would contain instructions);

       instructions for receiving an annotation file having one or more term expansions

(a email application for receiving a application-specific or domain-specific translation

table, col. 4, lines 55-60); and

       instructions for replacing, in the document, a term of the one or more terms with

a corresponding term expansion from the annotation file (a procedure for expanding

terms within the supplied document, col. 7, lines 26-30).

       Malsheen et al. do not teach the computer program product is a plug-in for a web

browser.

       However, Miller teaches constructing a resource description framework is an

application of XML (page 1), where the resource description framework is able to

distribute information on the World Wide Web.

       Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary art at the time of the

invention to combine the text analyst system of Malsheen et al. with the resource

description framework and the property values of Miller to improve the access to he

globally distributed information of the World Wide Web, as taught by Miller (page 1).

Conclusion

12.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to

applicant's disclosure. See PTO-892.

13.   Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in

this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37

CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

14.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thomas E. Shortledge whose telephone number is (571)272-7612. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00 - 4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richemond Dorvil can be reached on (571)272-7602. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

TS
7/19/2005

RICHEMOND DORVIL
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER